



Kevin: Realworldfare (*formerly Kevin: Walker*)  
**Care of:** 30650 Rancho California Road #406-251  
Temecula, California [92591]  
*non-domestic without* the United States  
Email: [team@walkernovagroup.com](mailto:team@walkernovagroup.com)

***Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party,  
Injured Party***

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Kevin: Walker,**  
*Plaintiff/Real Party In Interest,*

*vs.*

**Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman,  
Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V  
Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt,  
Robert Gell, Nicholas Gruwell, Joseph  
Sinz, Michael Hestrin, Miranda  
Thomson,  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF, THE  
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHWEST JUSTICE  
CENTER, FERGUSON PRAET &  
SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION, Does 1-100 Inclusive**  
*Defendant(s).*

Case No. 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA  
**VERIFIED NOTICE OF OBJECTION  
TO “CHAMBERS COPY”  
REQUIREMENT AS  
UNCONSTITUTIONAL  
OBSTRUCTION AND DEMAND FOR  
FINAL DECREE IN EQUITY**

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE — IN  
EQUITY ONLY — EQUITY JURISDICTION  
PRESERVED)

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

This matter is brought in **equity**, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of this Court as authorized by **Article III, Section 2** of the Constitution of the United States. All statutory jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of Record. All rights are reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308.

COMES NOW **Kevin: Realworldfare** (*formerly Kevin: Walker*), **a natural, freeborn, living man** on the land and soil of the **De’Jure Republic**, **one of the people** of the united states of America, and the **Real Party in Interest, Respondent, and Injured Party** in this

1 matter. Kevin proceeds *sui juris*, by ***specially limited appearing only*** in **proper private**  
2 **capacity, not** as a 14th Amendment “U.S. citizen,” **not** as a corporate “person,” **not** pro se,  
3 **not** pro per, not as a “resident,” and **not** through any fictitious legal construct — but as **one**  
4 **of the people, the Plaintiff, Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, and Creditor**, standing  
5 on the land and soil jurisdiction of the **De Jure Republic**, without adhesion, contract, or  
6 submission to any foreign corporate entity posing as government. Real Party In Interest  
7 invokes this Court’s **original jurisdiction in equity**, as vested under **Article III** of the  
8 Constitution for the United States of America and demands adjudication according to the  
9 **facts, truth, common law, the Bill of Rights**, and applicable constitutional guarantees.  
10 Accordingly, this Court sits in **equity alone**. There exists no plain, speedy, or adequate  
11 remedy at law. Plaintiffs have been robbed of their private trust property, dispossessed  
12 without lawful jurisdiction, denied due process, and obstructed from every statutory avenue  
13 of redress.

14 The law provides no substitute. The statutes are exhausted, the remedies at law are illusory,  
15 and the fraud perpetrated under color of law can only be corrected by equity. As the  
16 Supreme Court has long held, “*Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy*” (*Marbury*  
17 *v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)); and where law fails, “*equity steps in to do justice.*”  
18 Thus, this Court has **exclusive, unavoidable jurisdiction in equity** to restore possession,  
19 quiet title, vacate void acts, and grant full restitution. Any refusal to act would not merely  
20 deny justice — it would ratify theft, fraud, and treason under color of law.

21 Equity alone remains. **There is no alternate avenue.**

## 22 **I. SUMMARY OF FACTS AND HARM**

23 Plaintiff/Secured Party/Real Party In Interest, Kevin: Realworldfare, duly and lawfully  
24 submitted a **VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT**  
25 **JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, As a Matter of Law under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**  
26 **54, 55, and 56** based on **unrebutted material facts, perfected commercial records,**  
27 **dishonor by silence, and the absence of any genuine issue of material fact.** Said motion  
28 was supported by:

- 1 • Verified affidavits sworn under penalty of perjury,
- 2 • Attached exhibits evidencing tender, default, and perfected title, and
- 3 • A complete factual and legal record sufficient to warrant immediate judgment as a
- 4 matter of equity and law.

5 The Verified Motion and Demand was filed in person at the Clerk's Office, properly  
6 timestamped, and **entered into the official record** as received. **No opposition,**  
7 **rebuttal, or competing affidavit** has been filed by any party. As such, all material  
8 allegations stand **judicially admitted and legally binding** by:

- 9 • **Operation of law,**
- 10 • **Doctrine of estoppel,** and
- 11 • **Commercial default and dishonor.**

12 Despite the completeness of the filing and the absence of any factual dispute, the Clerk and/  
13 or Chambers staff have subjected the motion to an **administrative "Mandatory Chambers**  
14 **Copy" standing order**, which demands that a physical copy of any filed motion be  
15 delivered **no later than 12:00 p.m. (noon) the following business day** after the date of  
16 filing — or, in the case of voluminous filings, no later than noon on the second business day.

17 This order is:

- 18 • **Procedurally arbitrary,**
- 19 • **Jurisdictionally void,**
- 20 • **Unreasonable and burdensome,** and
- 21 • **Legally insufficient to override Plaintiff's constitutional and equitable rights.**

22 It is well established that:

23 "Federal rules, statutes, and constitutional rights **cannot** be nullified by local  
24 customs, practices, or standing orders."

25 — *Marshall v. Gates*, 44 F.3d 722, 725 (9th Cir. 1995)

26 Enforcement of this chambers copy rule — particularly **where the motion is otherwise**  
27 **complete, un rebutted, and lawfully before the Court** — constitutes:

- 28 • **Obstruction of access to justice,**

- **Unlawful interference with adjudication in equity**, and
- **A constructive denial of remedy.**

Plaintiff objects to any delay, denial, or adverse treatment of the motion on the basis of this **non-substantive administrative preference**, and asserts that no such rule can lawfully bar adjudication **on verified facts, un rebutted evidence, and perfected claims.**

## **II. OBJECTION TO THE “MANDATORY CHAMBERS COPIES” REQUIREMENT**

Plaintiff expressly objects to any refusal, delay, or dismissal based on failure to deliver a paper “chambers copy” of filings, and asserts the following:

- Such a requirement is not part of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and has **no lawful force** when it obstructs access to remedy or prejudices a party asserting equitable jurisdiction.
- Enforcement of this local administrative custom as a condition precedent to adjudication constitutes **constructive fraud, simulated legal process, and a denial of due process** in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

“A state [or officer] may not deny a litigant a protected interest in liberty or property simply because an agency failed to meet its own procedural deadline.”

— *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 433 (1982)

“A fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.”

— *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965)

## **III. NOTICE OF IMPOSSIBILITY AND PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff and Real Party In Interest, Kevin: Realworldfare, is presently located outside the territorial bounds of this Court, is not a licensed attorney, and is proceeding *sui juris*, by ***specially limited appearing only in proper private capacity, not*** as a 14th Amendment “U.S. citizen,” **not** as a corporate “person,” **not** pro se, **not** pro per, not as a “resident,” and **not** through any fictitious legal construct — but as **one of the people, the Plaintiff, Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, and Creditor**, standing on the land and soil jurisdiction of

1 the **De Jure Republic**, without adhesion, contract, or submission to any foreign corporate  
2 entity posing as government. Real Party In Interest invokes this Court's **original**  
3 **jurisdiction in equity**, as vested under **Article III** of the Constitution for the United States  
4 of America and demands adjudication according to the **facts, truth, common law, the Bill**  
5 **of Rights**, and applicable constitutional guarantees.

6 Accordingly, this Court sits in **equity alone**.

7 Plaintiff is likewise without access to overnight courier services or in-person delivery  
8 capacity, making compliance with the Court's **24-hour chambers copy requirement**  
9 physically impossible and legally unreasonable.

10 This standing order, when enforced as a **precondition to adjudication or motion review**,  
11 constitutes:

- 12 • **Discrimination by class and geographic location;**
- 13 • **An unreasonable and arbitrary barrier to meaningful access to court;**
- 14 • **And a direct violation of Plaintiff's right to due process and remedy in equity.**

15 "The Due Process Clause guarantees the right to be heard and the opportunity to present  
16 one's case in a meaningful manner."

17 — *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976)

18 "The right of access to the courts is a fundamental right protected by the Constitution."

19 — *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 828 (1977)

20 "**Dismissal or denial based on failure to comply with a local rule is improper where**  
21 **it works to defeat access to the court.**"

22 — *United States v. \$32,934.23 in U.S. Currency*, 20 F.3d 1080, 1082 (10th Cir. 1994)

23 "**Where procedural rules become obstacles to relief — rather than means to achieve**  
24 **justice — courts must set them aside.**"

25 — *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 181 (1962)

26 "There is no justification for applying different rules to pro se litigants... and procedural  
27 rules should **not** be enforced with unnecessary rigidity."

28 — *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)

1 “An individual's right to file a legal claim **cannot** be conditioned on compliance with  
2 rules that unreasonably burden or obstruct the exercise of that right.”

3 — *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371, 380 (1971)

4 “A state [or its officers] may not deny a litigant a protected interest... simply because the  
5 agency failed to meet its own procedural requirement.”

6 — *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 433 (1982)

7 “Fundamental fairness requires that individuals be afforded a meaningful opportunity to  
8 present their claims... Rules cannot be applied so rigidly as to defeat that opportunity.”

9 — *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976)

10 “The concept of fairness must not be strained until it is narrowed to a filament.”

11 — *Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 837 (1991)

12 “Where access to the courts is concerned, classifying pro se litigants differently and  
13 subjecting them to different procedural burdens can be unconstitutional.”

14 — *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 828 (1977)

15 **In the Ninth Circuit, the law is clear:**

16 **“It is an abuse of discretion for a district court to dismiss or deny claims for purely  
17 procedural reasons where the substantive rights have been properly asserted.”**

18 — *Lucas v. Dep’t of Corr.*, 66 F.3d 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995)

19 **“Procedural rules must not be applied in a manner that deprives litigants of a  
20 meaningful opportunity to be heard.”**

21 — *Mendocino Environmental Center v. Mendocino County*, 192 F.3d 1283, 1298 (9th  
22 Cir. 1999)

23 “Courts are to construe filings by pro se litigants liberally and with leniency in the face  
24 of procedural technicalities.”

25 — *Bretz v. Kelman*, 773 F.2d 1026, 1027 n.1 (9th Cir. 1985) (en banc)

26 **“A local rule or standing order cannot override the Constitution, the Federal Rules  
27 of Civil Procedure, or statutory rights.”**

28 — *Marshall v. Gates*, 44 F.3d 722, 725 (9th Cir. 1995)

The Court's rigid application of a chambers copy rule — in the absence of any showing of necessity or prejudice — transforms a **ministerial convenience** into a **weaponized gatekeeping device**, violating the very foundation of **equity**, which commands that:

*“Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy.”*

— *Story’s Equity Jurisprudence*, § 33

The U.S. Constitution **does not permit access to remedy to be conditioned upon arbitrary courier deadlines or physical presence** — particularly not where a party proceeds in verified good faith, in equity, and upon a complete electronic record already submitted to the Court and opposing parties.

In light of these authorities, any delay or denial of Plaintiff’s motion based solely on the absence of a chambers copy — when the full filing was electronically submitted and served — is not merely improper, but **legally void**. It deprives Plaintiff of meaningful access, **chills** the exercise of lawful rights, and constitutes **simulated legal process under color of office**.

#### **IV. DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE REVIEW AND FINAL DECREE**

Plaintiff hereby **demands immediate adjudication** on the merits of the [VERIFIED](#) MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, As a Matter of Law under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54, 55, and 56, and asserts that **no procedural defect, including the absence of a chambers copy**, may be lawfully used to obstruct or delay final resolution. The record is complete, undisputed, and binding.

Plaintiff demands that the Court:

1. **Vacate or disregard** any procedural denial, delay, or obstruction based on failure to deliver a “chambers copy” of filings;
2. **Immediately adjudicate** the [VERIFIED](#) MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, As a Matter of Law under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54, 55, and 56 based on the **unrebutted affidavits, perfected filings, and verified facts** now before the Court;
3. **Issue a Final Decree in Equity**, as no genuine issue of material fact remains, and as equity demands that “that which ought to be done is treated as done”;



4. Take **mandatory judicial notice** of all properly filed and served verified affidavits, exhibits, and declarations — now binding by **operation of law, commercial estoppel, and silence in dishonor**.

**Binding Case Law and Ninth Circuit Authority:**

“Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true.”

— *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981)

“Silence, where there is a duty to speak, amounts to fraud.”

— *United States v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297, 299 (5th Cir. 1977)

“Where the record taken as a whole could not lead a rational trier of fact to find for the nonmoving party, there is no genuine issue for trial.”

— *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)

“A verified complaint or motion, when unopposed by affidavits or evidence, may **[must]** serve as the basis for summary judgment.”

— *Ford v. City of Yakima*, 706 F.3d 1188, 1192 (**9th Cir.** 2013)

“Where no opposition is filed, the court **must** determine whether the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law — and may not deny it merely due to procedural defect.”

— *Martinez v. Stanford*, 323 F.3d 1178, 1182 (**9th Cir.** 2003)

“The failure to respond to evidence or argument may **[must]** be treated as consent to the granting of the motion.”

— *Bryant v. Carlson*, 652 F. Supp. 1286, 1289 (D. Mont. 1987), *aff’d*, 841 F.2d 1116 (**9th Cir.** 1988)

“Courts have no discretion to disregard controlling facts supported by unrebutted affidavit.”

— *Schwarzer, Tashima & Wagstaffe, Cal. Prac. Guide: Fed. Civ. Pro. Before Trial*, § 14:125

“Equity will not suffer a wrong to be without a remedy.”

— *Portman v. County of Santa Clara*, 995 F.2d 898, 904 (**9th Cir.** 1993)



“Where the rights of parties depend upon facts which are not in dispute, and where no defense is presented, the court must enter judgment without delay.”

— *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)

#### **V. PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND RESERVATION OF CLAIMS**

Plaintiff reserves all unalienable and secured rights pursuant to **UCC § 1-308, Article III**, and the common law. No joinder is made to any local rule, administrative order, or court practice that:

- Violates due process,
- Deprives Plaintiff of remedy in equity,
- Or serves as a commercial obstruction to adjudication of lawful claims.

This Notice shall serve as a **formal objection**, a **demand for correction**, and **constructive notice of harm** for any further obstruction, which may be grounds for:

- A **judicial complaint under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act**,
- A **Bivens claim**, or
- A **civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983** for deprivation of rights under color of law.

#### **VI. NOTICE OF NON-CONSENT TO LOCAL RULE JOINDER AND ASSERTION OF ARTICLE III ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff hereby provides formal **notice of non-consent to any joinder, adherence, or contractual presumption** regarding local rules, standing orders, or administrative procedures that conflict with or obstruct access to equitable remedy under the Constitution of the United States and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff asserts this action in original and exclusive jurisdiction under **Article III, Section 2**, wherein this Court is bound to act as a **Court of Record in equity**, not an administrative tribunal enforcing internal preference over constitutional duty.

Any attempt to subordinate adjudication of verified claims to non-substantive, clerical customs — such as the chambers copy requirement — constitutes a **jurisdictional defect** and deprives the Court of the lawful power to delay, deny, or defer adjudication on the record.

1 “Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power  
2 authorized by Constitution and statute.”

3 — *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)

4 “Where jurisdiction is challenged, the burden is on the court to prove it exists.”

5 — *Stuck v. Medical Examiners*, 94 Cal. App. 2d 751 (1950); see also *Steel Co. v. Citizens*  
6 *for a Better Environment*, 523 U.S. 83 (1998)

7 “No rule of court or local procedure can abrogate the constitutional right to be heard, nor  
8 may such procedures impose an undue burden on access to remedy.”

9 — *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938)

10 “A party may not be compelled into legal obligations absent knowing, voluntary, and  
11 intentional consent.”

12 — *Wheaton v. Peters*, 33 U.S. 591 (1834); *Overmyer v. Frick*, 405 U.S. 174, 187 (1972)

13 Accordingly, Plaintiff **rejects any presumption of consent** to the chambers copy rule, or  
14 any non-substantive standing order, where enforcement would prejudice access to justice,  
15 result in delay, or violate fundamental fairness. Any judicial officer acting upon such rules in  
16 contradiction to their constitutional oath may be deemed to have engaged in **simulated legal**  
17 **process, administrative usurpation, and constructive fraud under color of office.**

18 Plaintiff further reserves all rights to invoke **judicial misconduct review, mandamus**  
19 **relief, and civil liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Bivens v. Six Unknown Named**  
20 **Agents**, should this pattern of procedural obstruction persist.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

**VERIFICATION:**


**Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746**

I, Kevin: Realworldfare, over the age of 18, competent to testify, and having **firsthand knowledge** of the facts stated herein, do hereby **declare, certify, verify, affirm, and state** under penalty of perjury under the laws of the **United States of America**, that the foregoing statements are **true, correct, and complete**, to the best of my **understanding, knowledge, and belief**, and made in **good faith**.

Executed, signed, and sealed this 14th day of August in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty five, *without* the United States.

**All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.**

By:



**Kevin: Realworldfare**, Real Party In Interest,  
*Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party*

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

## **LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:**

1. **Exhibit A:** Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact'
2. **Exhibit B:** Hold Harmless Agreement
3. **Exhibit C:** Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC1 filing #**2024385925-4**.
4. **Exhibit D:** Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC3 filing ##**2024402990-2** .
5. **Exhibit E:** **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775820621US**, titled: **NOTICE OF**  
**CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE**, and **FRAUD, RACKETEERING,**  
**CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW,**  
**IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON.**
6. **Exhibit F:** **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775821088US**, titled: **NOTICE OF**  
**DEFAULT**, and **FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF**  
**RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION,**  
**COERCION, TREASON**
7. **Exhibit G:** **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775822582US**, titled: **NOTICE OF**  
**DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE** AND **NOTICE OF FRAUD,**  
**RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE**  
**COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION,**  
**KIDNAPPING.**
8. **Exhibit H:** **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775823645US**, titled: **Affidavit**  
**Certificate** of Dishonor, Non-response, **DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN**  
**AUTHORIZATION.**
9. **Exhibit I:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E.
10. **Exhibit J:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.
11. **Exhibit K:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
12. **Exhibit L:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.
13. **Exhibit M:** INVOICE/TRUE BILL #**RIVSHERTREAS12312024**
14. **Exhibit N:** Copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND'  
#**RF661448567US**.

- 1 15. **Exhibit O:** Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Gregory D Eastwood.
- 2 16. **Exhibit P:** Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Robert C V Bowman.
- 3 17. **Exhibit Q:** Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Willam Pratt.
- 4 18. **Exhibit R:** Affidavit 'Right to Travel': *CANCELLATION, TERMINATION, AND*
- 5 *REVOCAION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT*
- 6 *and AGREEMENT. LICENSE/BOND # B6735991*
- 7 19. **Exhibit S:** Revocation Termination and Cancelation of Franchise.
- 8 20. **Exhibit T:** CITATION/BOND #[TE464702](#), accepted **under threat, duress, and**
- 9 **coercion.**
- 10 21. **Exhibit U:** Private Transport's PRIVATE PLATE displayed on the automobile
- 11 22. **Exhibit V:** Copy of "Automobile" and "commercial vehicle" defined by DMV
- 12 (Department of Motor Vehicles).
- 13 23. **Exhibit W:** Copy of CA CODE § 260 from <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>.
- 14 24. **Exhibit X:** national/non-citizen national passport card #[C35510079](#).
- 15 25. **Exhibit Y:** national/non-citizen national passport book #[A39235161](#).
- 16 26. **Exhibit Z:** <sup>TM</sup>KEVIN LEWIS WALKER© Copyright and Trademark Agreement.
- 17 27. **Exhibit AA:** A copy of American Bar Association's 'Attorney In Fact' Definition.
- 18 28. **Exhibit BB:** A Copy of Rule 8.4: (Misconduct) of the American Bar Association.
- 19 29. **Exhibit CC:** Twenty-six 3811 forms showing Defendants' acceptance of service
- 20 of all documents via USPS and electronic service, including SUMMONS and
- 21 COMPLAINT.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

# PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
) ss.  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE )

I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, **care of:** 30650 Rancho California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about **August 14, 2025**, I served the within documents:

**1. VERIFIED NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO “CHAMBERS COPY”**  
**REQUIREMENT AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL OBSTRUCTION AND DEMAND**  
**FOR FINAL DECREE IN EQUITY**

**By Electronic Service.** Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below.

Steven-Arthur: Sherman  
C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN, FERGUSON PRAET &  
SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
1631 East 18th Street  
Santa Ana, California [92705-7101]  
[ssherman@law4cops.com](mailto:ssherman@law4cops.com)  
[csherman@law4cops.com](mailto:csherman@law4cops.com)

Chad: Bianco, Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas Gruwell,  
C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF  
4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor  
Riverside, California [92501]  
[ssherman@law4cops.com](mailto:ssherman@law4cops.com)  
[csherman@law4cops.com](mailto:csherman@law4cops.com)  
[rsoscscentral@riversidesheriff.org](mailto:rsoscscentral@riversidesheriff.org)  
[jsinz@riversidesheriff.org](mailto:jsinz@riversidesheriff.org)  
[wpratt@riversidesheriff.org](mailto:wpratt@riversidesheriff.org)

Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin  
C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF  
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, **SOUTHWEST**  
JUSTICE CENTER  
3960 Orange Street  
Riverside, California [92501]

[DAOffice@rivco.org](mailto:DAOffice@rivco.org)

Rob Bonta  
C/o PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
3960 Orange Street  
Riverside, California [92501]  
[piu@doj.ca.gov](mailto:piu@doj.ca.gov)  
[Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on **August 14, 2025** in Riverside County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/  
Chris Yarbra